



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SO-CALLED "EBED-YAHWEH SONGS," AND
THE MEANING OF THE TERM "SERVANT OF
YAHWEH" IN ISAIAH, CHAPS. 40-55.¹

By KARL BUDDÉ,
Strassburg, Germany.

ONE of the most noteworthy features of recent Old Testament criticism is doubtless the tendency to interpret in a collective sense the "I" of certain portions of the Old Testament. This sense of the pronoun is found by interpreters not only in the Psalms, but in many other books as well; and that, too, in passages in which no hint from the author suggests such an interpretation, and in which the individual traits are so clearly marked that an interpretation of this kind makes it necessary to presuppose a continuous allegory throughout. We are all the more surprised, then, to find that in *one* point scholars are tending to move in exactly the opposite direction, and with ever-increasing unanimity. In a passage in which formerly the individual was taken, almost unanimously, to represent a community, and in which this interpretation is confirmed by unmistakable expressions on the part of the author, it is now confidently affirmed that the reference is to a single individual. So positively, indeed, is this held that it has been actually attempted by revising and "correcting" to force the collective name out of the text. I refer, of course, to the servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah. The question which the presentation of such views has opened anew has been discussed with the utmost eagerness; the past year alone has witnessed the publication in Germany of no fewer than four monographs, all more or less from this point of view.² It is a well-known fact that this exposition

¹ I desire to call attention particularly to the fact that in this treatise I have seldom referred to Canon Cheyne's view, and that with great caution, because his latest expression on this subject in the "Sacred Books of the Old Testament" has hitherto been inaccessible to me.

² L. LAUE, *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder im II. Theil des Jesaja*, 1898; ERNST SELLIN, *Serubbabel*, u. s. w., 1898; ALFRED BERTHOLET, *Zu Jesaja 53*, 1899; RUDOLF KITTEL, *Zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1899, II, "Jesaja 53 und der leidende Messias im Alten Testament."

had its origin in Göttingen. It was Heinrich Ewald³ who first separated 52:13—53:12⁴ from its connection, claiming that it is a production of the time of Manasseh, and that it refers to an unknown martyr, perhaps to Isaiah. He believed that Deutero-Isaiah inserted it in this connection, because the latter could find no better words than these earlier ones with which to express his thoughts concerning the servant of Yahweh, as he conceived of him, viz., in a collective sense; and that only here and there, in 52:14; 53:10 f., did he add any original matter. Bernhard Duhm⁵ expanded this theory, to the effect that 42:1-7; 49:1-6; 50:4-9 are also taken from a separate writing, which in turn may have been based upon a narrative of the life and work of Jeremiah, perhaps written by a younger contemporary prophet. Duhm suggested that these passages were inserted and at the same time freely revised by Deutero-Isaiah. But all this he set forth merely as "not impossible." Not until he had very positively reasserted the same view, with a few material alterations,⁶ in his commentary on Isaiah,⁷ did he receive such general support that, as Bertholet affirms, his opinion has now become almost common property. Those who do not wish this to become the universally accepted view have therefore no time to lose in entering their protest. To enter such protest on my part is the purpose of the present article. For I see in this view a deplorable error which not only obstructs the understanding of one of the grandest books of the Old Testament and one of the most important steps in the development of Old Testament religion, but makes such an understanding entirely impossible.

In *what* is there unanimity? *What* is about to become common property? Certainly not that the four passages I have

³ *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*², Vol. III, 1868, pp. 27, 89 ff.

⁴ "54, 12," on p. 27, is a misprint.

⁵ *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875, p. 289.

⁶ The first passage has been restricted to include only 42:1-4. The hero seems to have been a historical person, a teacher of the thorah, and a pastor; the composition of these "Ebed-Yahweh songs" probably dates back to the first half of the fifth century.

⁷ NOWACK'S *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, III, 1, 1892, "Das Buch Jesaia."

named (viz., Isa. 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13—53:12) are no longer to be attributed to Deutero-Isaiah; for aside from the hesitancy with which Cheyne⁸ expresses himself on this point, it seems to me that Sellin, who is otherwise one of the most decided followers of Duhm, has brought forward cogent reasons for attributing all of them to Deutero-Isaiah himself.⁹ Nor has it been unanimously accepted that these four passages belong together, and to one author, for Schian,¹⁰ Kusters,¹¹ and Laue¹² attribute chap. 53, and Bertholet at least the greater part of it, to still another author, while Ley and Laue see in 50:4-9 a passage of separate origin.¹³ Is there unanimity in restricting the theory to these four passages? Scarcely, when Sellin¹⁴ adds to them a fifth in 42:18-25, and finds kinship with it in many other places, and Laue believes 51:16 to be either an Ebed-Yahweh fragment or a comment upon one.¹⁵ Quite as divided are the opinions in regard to the interpretation of the servant as representing an individual. Kusters¹⁶ considers this interpretation everywhere out of the question; in the fourth passage he sees the congregation of the pious, in the remaining ones the collective conception of certain teachers of the law who taught in the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah. Bertholet also accepts the latter explanation, with some slight modification, everywhere except in the interpolated passage 53:1-11*a*, in which, according to his view, an individual is meant. Smend¹⁷ clearly recognizes a collective conception, the people of Israel, at least in chaps. 42 and 49. Kittel, in his commentary, expresses himself in a very undecided manner. But are those who interpret the

⁸ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895, p. 309.

⁹ SELLIN, pp. 97 ff. and 105 ff.

¹⁰ *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder in Jes. 40-66*, p. 53.

¹¹ *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1896, pp. 591 ff.

¹² LAUE, p. 11.

¹³ LEY, *Historische Erklärung des zweiten Teils des Jesaja*, 1893, pp. 63 f., 71 f., 85; LAUE, p. 8.

¹⁴ SELLIN, pp. 107 f., 216.

¹⁵ LAUE, p. 16.

¹⁶ *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁷ *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 1893, pp. 256 ff., esp. p. 261.

servant as an individual unanimous even among themselves? So far is this from being the case that Laue emphatically restores the conception of the Messiah of the future, while the others traverse the whole period between Isaiah and the time of the Macabees in order to find the historical martyr to whom the song, or songs, could apply. I need not discuss the various explanations of the manner in which the songs were introduced into their present connection, whether accidentally or otherwise; at this point all the paths diverge. So much so, indeed, that one could scarcely imagine the possibility of a greater confusion; and yet I am convinced that it is by no means at an end. For only truth is simple, while error involves us in a thousand devious ways. Nor will it be necessary therefore to follow up each and every new version in particular. In fact, under these circumstances I know of no better way than to begin my discussion at the point regarding which all those whom I have named, excepting Kusters, are unanimous, namely with the interpretation of the hero of 53: 1 ff. as an individual. This brings us back to our starting-point, to Heinrich Ewald.

CHAPS. 52: 13—53: 12.

The fundamental objection to the collective interpretation of the servant of Yahweh in chap. 53 is, as Ewald expresses it, the fact that "nowhere else does the prophet represent the servant so emphatically as a single individual of the past." In various forms of expression nearly all the later commentators¹⁸ repeat the same idea. And yet it is surely evident that this is merely a subjective impression and nothing more; no hard and fast rule of expression can be laid down for the representation of an individual on the one hand, as distinct from the individualizing of a community on the other. Moreover, in recent criticism, the particular characteristics which 53: 1 ff. exhibits are,

¹⁸ Compare particularly SELLIN (cited above), p. 149: "If the three songs, 49: 1-6 (*cf.* esp. vss. 2, 5 f.); 50: 4-9 (*cf.* esp. vss. 4, 6); 52: 13-53: 12 (*cf.* esp. 53: 1, 2, 5, 9), do not plainly speak of a definite individual, who had a mission to the people, who suffered, and who at the time when the last composition was written was already dead, then I am at a loss to know how anything could be expressed in plain language."

whenever they occur elsewhere, claimed by the opposite side, with an exactly opposite interpretation, as a proof that the "I" of the subject is collective. In vs. 2 the speakers see the servant coming into the world and growing up as an unusually weak, puny, insignificant child.¹⁹ In vss. 3 f. he is afflicted with a loathsome disease, which beyond all doubt is leprosy. In vss. 5, 7 he is tortured and abused by external violence; in vs. 8 death overtakes him. Whether his death is caused by this same external violence, or whether it places him beyond the reach of that violence, we are no longer able to make out with certainty from the text as it now stands. This very mingling of the most varied misfortunes and sufferings Smend²⁰ once used very cleverly, in treating of the psalms that speak of the poet's sickness, as an argument for the collective "I," and found many adherents. We can readily understand, then, why Duhm should wish to reduce these various manifestations of suffering to the single one of leprosy. But that is by no means possible. Nor will it avail to eliminate entirely the maltreatment of the servant from 53:5 ff., because in 50:6, as Duhm also admits, he himself bears witness to it, and to it only, without any reference whatever to leprosy. Moreover, according to vs. 2, the servant has been the picture of wretchedness from his very birth. But by what process of transformation a child born in leprosy could have become Duhm's teacher of the law, or Bertholet's Eleazar, not to mention Sellin's Zerubbabel, is by no means apparent.²¹ Nor will Smend's rather timid suggestion hold good, that possibly there lived a prophetic martyr who was persecuted, and who at the same time was actually sick. It is, rather, in his preceding sentence that Smend is right, when he says: "Now, since the distress which is brought upon Israel by its enemies is very often represented metaphorically as a disease, both in the prophets

¹⁹ Along with *וְנִרְאָהוּ*, the emendation of *לְפָנָיו* to *לְפָנָיו* (Ewald, Giesebrecht, Cheyne, etc.) becomes absolutely necessary, although the above conception does not depend upon the alteration.

²⁰ *Zeitschr. f. alttest. Wiss.*, 1888, pp. 68 ff.

²¹ Sellin therefore vigorously opposes a literal interpretation of the passages which speak of disease. Only in regard to disease resulting from maltreatment does he leave the question open. *Cf.* pp. 161 f.

and in the Psalms, it seems very probable that we have here an instance of the common personification of Israel, and that the disease and death of Yahweh's servant either denotes the destruction of Israel or at least coincides with it."²² Very similar to the view expressed in this sentence is that of Laue, who actually affirms that a "sickness-psalm" or a theodicy-psalm was the basis of the passage in question, and then takes particular pains to defend the individual interpretation of Pss. 6, 38, 22, etc. (pp. 11, 49 ff.). Here too—although it is expressed in slightly different terms—we find the same argument with which Smend endeavors to support the individuality of the servant against his own counter-arguments.

But most conclusive is the fact of the death and revivification of the servant. This is entirely natural as applied to a community, to a people, whose personality continues through succeeding generations. Ezekiel, chap. 37, has familiarized everyone with the figure of awakening from the dead as representing the restoration of the people of Israel, nor was the figure less familiar in the days of Deutero-Isaiah.²³ On the other hand, in order to interpret these expressions as applying to an individual, we are obliged to resort to all kinds of improbable suppositions to sustain this interpretation.²⁴ Certainly the least plausible attempt to apply this resurrection to an individual is the suggestion that his existence is continued in his spiritual descendants. That the servant has descendants is set forth in vs. 10, along with the other statement that he himself lives to an old age; unless the latter statement is removed by revision of the text.²⁵ But particularly noticeable is the personal character of the representation maintained throughout the entire passage. The same servant whose death and burial are portrayed in vss. 8 f. stands before the speakers in the very first verse of the passage (52: 13), raised from the dead, and with unexpected splendor.

²² *Alltest. Theol.*, p. 257.

²³ *Cf. esp. LAUE*, pp. 46 ff.

²⁴ For numerous passages in the Psalms with the same content *cf. KOSTERS, Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1896, p. 594.

²⁵ *BERTHOLET*, p. 22.

This is simply impossible as applied to any of the individuals who have been suggested in this connection, but very easily comprehended when applied to a community. Therefore the assertion that the individual interpretation of chap. 53 is necessary, and the collective interpretation impossible, must be exactly reversed; in view of the whole tenor of the chapter, the collective conception alone has any claim upon our consideration. Wellhausen rightly says:²⁶ "It would be presumptuous to depart from this interpretation and think of an individual."

It is easy to see, indeed, that Smend at least would accept this conclusion, if he could only succeed in determining in some reasonable way who the persons speaking and the person spoken of are. If "the penitent Israel of the future" is to be regarded as the speaker, and "the true Israel within the false" as the person spoken of, *i. e.*, as the servant,²⁷ then, to be sure, we should have to despair of attaining a right understanding of the passage, because the sufferings which Israel endured fell, without reference to this distinction, upon all alike. In reality the speakers, the "we" of vss. 1 ff., are the heathen nations; the servant of Yahweh of whom they speak is the people of Israel. I have never been able to understand why Giesebrecht's²⁸ excellent exposition of this old interpretation did not settle the question, at least for some time, and why his work is mentioned only casually, if at all, in the numerous recent treatises on this subject. Duhm, commenting upon 53: 1 ff., simply says: "Oddly enough, many commentators attribute these words to all sorts of strange speakers; sometimes to those who once were unbelievers, *then again even to the heathen of 52: 15*. But inasmuch as there is not the slightest allusion to so remote a speaker, why should it not be the author himself?" Kittel²⁹ contents himself with repeating

²⁶ *Israelitische u. jüdische Geschichte*¹, p. 117.

²⁷ So also in Kusters.

²⁸ *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 1890, pp. 146 ff.: "Die Idee von Jesaia 52, 13-53, 12." I wish to acknowledge, once for all, my indebtedness to this fundamental work in order that in the following pages I may develop my argument without constant reference to Giesebrecht.

²⁹ In his new edition of the KNOBEL-DILLMANN Commentary in the *Kurzgefasste exegetische Handbuch*, 1898, p. 449.

one of Dillmann's counter-arguments, although in the meantime the position of this interpretation had been materially strengthened by Giesebrecht: "We cannot take this 'we' to mean the nations (52:15), as is claimed by the rabbis, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Beck, and of late especially by Giesebrecht, because a confession on the part of the heathen that Israel had suffered for them would be entirely unprecedented in the Old Testament (Dillmann)." And this is Smend's only counter-argument of any importance in his rather more detailed discussion.³⁰ He adds that nowhere in Isaiah, chaps. 40 ff., is this idea alluded to, but that, on the contrary, Israel's sin is everywhere mentioned as the cause of its suffering. Dillmann advances the same argument, supporting it³¹ with the passages 42:24 f.; 43:27 f.; 47:6; 50:1, mentioning at the same time 42:13; 49:25 f.; 51:5, 23, and others, in which the punishment of the heathen is announced to them. These two series of passages are the only ones which are of any weight against the position here maintained. For no one, surely, would wish to deny that Deutero-Isaiah might introduce an entirely new thought not found in the earlier prophets; and the more peculiar that thought, the more natural it would seem that it should subsequently be forgotten. The only question that can arise is whether Deutero-Isaiah itself contains statements which oppose this interpretation. Now, it is certainly true that here and there the heathen nations are threatened with punishment, particularly those that have maltreated Israel. The threat against Babylon in chap. 47 is the culminating point of these expressions. But, at the same time, is not Cyrus represented as the anointed, the friend of Yahweh, to whom the fullest salvation is promised? Where in the Old Testament is this paralleled? And, what is of still greater importance, the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," according to unanimous opinion, state that the heathen as such (עֲבָדִים, 42:1; 49:6) are to receive the light, the true religion of Yahweh. Is not this salvation, and can we reconcile with this thought the penal annihilation of the heathen? Is it not, on the contrary, entirely possible that those nations upon whom judgment comes

³⁰ *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 258.

³¹ *Kurzgef. exeg. Hdb., Jesaja*⁵, 1890, pp. 455 f.

may subsequently be made to share in such salvation? So much as against the argument based on Dillmann's second list of passages.

This, to be sure, does not yet bring us to the thought that Israel suffered for the heathen, but it at least prepares the way for it. To me the most remarkable feature in Duhm's explanation of the servant of Yahweh has always been that this historic individual in Israel is to lead the heathen to a knowledge of Yahweh. This idea, whether conceived of as realized in Zerubabel or Eleazar, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Job, or anyone else, is nothing short of fantastic, and the extreme of absurdity. Nor is it any more satisfactory when applied collectively to the scribes or teachers of the law. Whether taken as signifying the entire class or, with Kusters and Bertholet, following Gesenius, as referring to a definite group within the class; whether with Kusters it be applied to the first three of the passages, or with Bertholet to all four, with the exception of Isa. 53: 1-11a—in all its forms the explanation is inadequate. Bertholet's arguments (pp. 11 f.) in support of this theory, it may be added, are exceedingly weak. Least of all can we comprehend how the abasement and exaltation of the servant, so interpreted, could make an impression upon the heathen such as is described in 52: 14 f. If, however, we seek in Deutero-Isaiah himself the explanation of this conception of Yahweh's servant, then, and only then, the matter assumes a different form. All the supporters of the theory of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" concede that everywhere outside of these songs the servant of Yahweh designates the people of Israel as such (41: 8; 42: 19, *cf.* 22; 43: 10 (?); 44: 1, 21; 45: 4; 48: 20). Israel is the sum total of all those who serve Yahweh and who enjoy the privilege of knowing him, and if this knowledge is to be transmitted through any human agency to other nations, it must be through that of the people of Israel. This is made possible, on the one hand, by the vicissitudes of Israel's fortunes and, on the other, by Israel's activity. The former is well illustrated in 52: 14 f. The joys and sorrows experienced by an individual, or even by an entire class within a nation, do not attract the attention of

another nation, certainly not of any considerable number of surrounding nations. But let a whole people be humiliated, even annihilated, and then wonderfully exalted again, and all the surrounding nations must be witnesses to the fact and cannot escape the impression made by such an event. And when, moreover, this people is robbed of its very existence, and scattered far and wide among foreign nations, it cannot be restored to its former estate without affecting those nations in its transformation. The more brilliantly and wonderfully Deutero-Isaiah, from the first chapter to the last, portrays this prospective restoration, the more powerful is the impression which we must conceive he expects it to make when it comes to pass. And this finds admirable corroboration in the statement made in 52:14 f. With the fortunes of a nation, however, is intimately connected, of course, its activity. The nation preaches Yahweh by its existence; by its own service of Yahweh; by the argument from prophecy, to which the prophet appeals again and again as perfectly convincing. Furthermore, it may preach him also by the word of prophets such as Deutero-Isaiah and other individuals who may venture to undertake such a task. But the accomplishment of this result is conditioned upon Israel's constant contact with the heathen nations as such, and therefore upon a scattering among the nations, a ceasing of its individual existence. In every respect, then, Israel's suffering, its very annihilation, is the prerequisite for the fulfilment of Israel's mission to the heathen, for the transmitting of salvation to other nations in the form of the religion of Yahweh. *Therefore* the heathen may well say in 53:5*b* that Israel, the servant of Yahweh, had *suffered for their salvation*. But he suffered also *in their stead*, in expiation of their guilt, as stated in 53:4, 5*a*, 6*b*. The heathen are taught by Israel that Yahweh alone is God. Thus their idolatry becomes guilt which they have all in their several ways incurred. "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one [every nation] to his own way" (6*a*).³² Consequently, Yahweh would

³² These words can be understood only as referring to this guilt. It would be sophistry to say that there could be no guilt on their part because Yahweh had

have been obliged to punish and destroy *them*. But he punished his own people instead, the only nation which honored him, the true God, and which therefore had deserved no punishment: "but the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all" (6*b*). Now they see that this was done through pure kindness for their salvation; for Israel's suffering was to be the means of their redemption.

Thus we dispose at once of the first series of passages upon which Dillmann bases his objections, those passages which speak of Israel's being punished for its *own* sins. Whatever justifying *grounds* Yahweh may have had for the chastisement of Israel, as respects the heathen, who are here the speakers, not these grounds, but Yahwe's purpose, comes into consideration. Though Israel may have sinned, yet in the conscience of the heathen the only worshiper of the true God appears as the only innocent one. But, further than that, it is a well-known fact that, compared with other prophets, Deutero-Isaiah lays very little stress upon Israel's trespass, that the tone of sympathy predominates throughout and strongly. Nor does he fail to state expressly that Israel has suffered more punishment than its sins have deserved. He begins his entire book with the statement that his people, that Jerusalem,³³ has received a double measure of retribution for its sins. This is not, as Duhm thinks, an allusion to Jer. 16:18, where a doubling of the punishment is announced, only, however, for renewed offenses.³⁴ On the

revealed himself only to Israel, and that he had not before been preached to the heathen. It goes without saying that Deutero-Isaiah's universalism is something very different from the old particularism of Israel's religion. If we read between the lines, we shall find the necessary complement in the two versions of the primeval history in Genesis. At the basis of all idolatry is a sinful straying away from the common original revelation of the only true God. Only a rectified conception of revelation can give us more light on the subject.

³³ By means of such passages as 48:2; 49:21, and especially 51:16, Duhm (Com., 40:2) proves that "my people" and "Jerusalem" virtually signify the same thing. This alone will suffice to discredit the attempt made by Briggs to split the book into two, one of which, he claims, deals with the deliverance of Yahweh's servant Israel, and the other with the deliverance of Zion, Yahweh's bride. In regard to this attempt cf. CHEYNE, *Introduction*, pp. 309 f. KOSTERS follows a similar line of thought, pp. 580 ff.

³⁴ As to the genuineness cf. Giesebrecht.

contrary, Deutero-Isaiah distinctly says that half of the punishment is undeserved, and on the basis of general prophetic premises we have a right to ask what may have been the occasion of this second undeserved portion; and when we find the figure of Yahweh's servant already introduced in 41:8, and his mission that of carrying the true religion to the heathen stated in 42:1, we cannot avoid the conclusion that even here the prophet already has reference to the suffering which was indispensable to the fulfilment of that mission. The problem of theodicy is for the entire century the really vital one. The people solve it, not without a feeling of bitterness, by applying the doctrine of suffering for the sins of the fathers, *i. e.*, for the sins of Manasseh (Ezek. 18:2, etc.), while Ezekiel tries to solve it by enormously exaggerating his accusations in an endeavor to balance guilt and punishment. Deutero-Isaiah alone finds a really satisfying solution by associating with the cause of the punishment its purpose, and we can understand all the more readily that this solution was beyond the comprehension of the masses of the people, as well as of most of its leading spirits, because his hopes and predictions were not realized. The glorious restoration of his nation did not come to pass, neither were its sufferings or its teachings able to lead the heathen to Yahweh. Under these circumstances we are not at all surprised that the understanding of such utterances was largely obscured, and that it was not long before their original forms were tampered with; in fact, what ought to surprise us is that this was not done to a far greater extent. Everyone knows that the second half of chap. 53 has suffered serious corruption of text;³⁵ but the only corruption which interferes with a proper interpretation is the עַמִּי in vs. 8, "for the transgression of *my people* was he stricken." But that admits of no explanation whatever. It cannot be explained by taking it as "Yahweh's people," and Yahweh as the "I," because in the tenth verse Yahweh is still spoken of in the third person. Nor can a member of the people—perhaps, as Duhm and Bertholet suggest, the prophet himself—be taken as the subject, because

³⁵ Cf. the numerous emendations suggested by Bertholet, pp. 20 ff., 15, which are, however, for the most part in the wrong direction.

the speaker throughout the entire passage is not "I," but "we." According to that we should at least expect עַמֵּנוּ "of our people," or, according to the interpretation which I am controverting, עַמּוֹ "of his people." But if we are to make a change and must do so, then quite the most probable reading is מִפְשָׁעֵינוּ "for our transgressions," which will easily explain the corruption מִפְשָׁע עַמִּי. This is the actual reading in vs. 5; cf. also vs. 4 and vs. 6.³⁶ Then the "we" of the text means just what it has meant from the first verse on. Others may interpret this "we" as the people of Israel, or as certain ones of the Israelites. We interpret it to mean the heathen. At any rate, the correct interpretation cannot be called in question on the strength of this one word, itself an evident corruption of the text.

With a proper interpretation of the passage we are able also to understand its literary form and many of its expressions, particularly the marked individualization which has so often been declared incompatible with the collective conception. This might furnish grounds for objection, it is true, if a few persons were speaking of their nation, or if the nation were speaking of one of its parts. But if all those who constitute the "we" are simply individual nations, then nothing is easier to comprehend than that the people of Israel appears to them as an individual also, and is treated and spoken of in an entirely personal manner. Moreover, the nations that are speaking are older and greater than Israel. Therefore they have seen the servant's coming into the world, and therefore, even before his sufferings, his puny form has aroused their disgust and scorn.

And only in this way is the introduction of the "we" and the connection with 52:13 ff. explicable. The "many nations" and their kings mentioned in these verses are in any case the only available plural subject. How Duhm can speak of them as remote subjects, while to the prophet they seem so near at hand that they are deeply moved by the fate of the servant, is beyond all comprehension. Smend explains that the "many" in vs. 14 are to be clearly distinguished from the "many nations" in vs.

³⁶ Only this emendation is perfectly satisfactory. Less acceptable is Giesebrecht's reading, מִפְשָׁעֵם יְהוָה, to which עַמִּי would be preferable.

15, and that the former has reference to the Israelites of the past. This again is impossible, and simply an evidence of extreme perplexity. Accordingly, vss. 13 ff. would have to be paraphrased thus: "as the Israelites of the past were amazed at the disfigured appearance of the servant, so shall the heathen nations of the present or future be moved by his glorification." The very logic of this sentence ought to warn us against accepting it. But at what are the speakers amazed in 53:1 ff. (surely not here the Israelites of the *past*), if not at the contrast between the present and the past appearance of the servant? They enlarge upon the picture of his dejection only *because* his present splendor stands in such inexplicable contrast to his former estate. They have, accordingly, seen both periods in his career, as have also the many nations and kings in 52:15, who of course are simply the "many" of vs. 14 more fully described. If the servant represents a nation, then the same is evidently true also of the many. Dillmann's objection that the nations of 52:15 cannot be the speakers in 53:1, because 15b is contradicted by 1a, is altogether too fine-spun. He is quite right, of course, in translating שְׁמִיעָתֵנוּ by "the report which we have received," not "our preaching." Now, it is stated in 52:15 that the heathen suddenly behold with their own eyes what hitherto they have not even so much as heard of. Undoubtedly this climax from hearsay to actual beholding is deliberately planned. But is it for this reason less probable that the nations should receive the report of the glorious restoration of Israel? *Formerly* they had heard nothing; *now* they hear and see. But, says Smend, a speech by the heathen would require a different, that is, a more distinct, introduction. And yet it is a well-known fact that everywhere in elevated style the express introduction may be omitted before a direct speech, and that in the prophets this omission is very common,³⁷ the condition of such omission being, of course, that the speaker shall be evident from the context. But, in this case, the only possible speakers are the heathen; the

³⁷ This is particularly the case in Deutero-Isaiah, and also in all the Ebed-Yahweh songs, whether Yahweh is the speaker, as in 42:1, or the servant, as in 49:1; 50:4. Exactly the same thing is true, therefore, of the "we" in 53:1. To hold that an introduction was once present and has been lost is entirely out of the question.

absence of an introduction, therefore, simply proves that they, and they alone, are meant. As applying to them the sudden burst of eloquence is poetically beautiful, while with any other reference it becomes labored and ungainly. In the latter case we have no other alternative than to sever all connection between 52:13-15 and 53:1 ff., as Bertholet, following Duhm's suggestion (p. 365), has done, by making 53:1-11a an interpolated martyr-song. The false interpretation of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," like *aqua fortis*, ruthlessly destroys all obstacles before it, and each succeeding one of its adherents finds something more to cut out. A single glance will convince anyone that all the arguments adduced by Bertholet on p. 30 in favor of this solution are based solely upon a wrong definition of the speaker and the person spoken of in the passage.

But chap. 53 is connected with still earlier passages just as closely as with 52:13-15, and in this connection also the correctness of our definition of the speakers finds corroboration. With an exclamation of surprise the speech begins: "Who would have believed it? Who would have considered that possible?"³⁸ The second half of the verse is not merely parallel to the first. Over against a subjective belief it speaks of objective visibility. Therefore the line, "but to whom was the arm of Yahweh [hitherto] revealed," is in antithesis to the preceding, and must be interpreted as an excuse. The speakers now believe the report which they have received, *because* the arm of Yahweh has now been revealed to them, that is, because they hear and see at the same time. But just before, in 52:10, it is said that Yahweh makes bare his holy arm; since that time, therefore, it has been visible.³⁹ Vs. 10b, and, in fact, the entire connection, tells us that by the arm of Yahweh is meant his saving and redeeming work in Israel and Jerusalem. Moreover, those before whose eyes the arm of Yahweh is made bare, those who are permitted to behold the salvation of Israel's God, are כל־הגִּוִּים

³⁸ Idiomatically expressed. The sense is: "No one would have believed what we are hearing." Cf. our, "Who would have thought it!" In Hebrew cf. מִי מֵלַל, Gen. 21:7.

³⁹ The result of the חִשָּׁה in the former passage is the נִלָּה here. For the interchange of both verbs in the same writer cf. 47:2 f.

"all nations," and כָּל-אַפְסֵי-אֶרֶץ "all the ends of the earth," so that, when in 53:1 the speakers premise as a fact that the arm of Yahweh has been revealed, and revealed to them, we cannot avoid the conclusion that they are the very nations, the dwellers in the ends of the earth, who in 52:10 are made witnesses of the work of Yahweh.⁴⁰ This, therefore, establishes who the speakers of chap. 53 are, and also the close connection of this chapter with what precedes, back to 51:9, where the arm of Yahweh is invoked for that new demonstration of power whose full realization is portrayed up to 52:12.⁴¹ Anyone, therefore, who desires to sever 52:13—53:12 from its connection is certainly bound to propose a suitable revision of 53:1.

CHAP. 50:4-9.

The connection between 51:9 and the preceding "Ebed-Yahweh song," 50:4-9, is very easily shown. The arm of Yahweh which is here invoked is in 51:5, according to Yahweh's own statement, the hope of the nations. But at the same time we find all sorts of links reaching across the boundary between the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" and what is usually attributed to Deutero-Isaiah. The servant's particular mission, as described in the first and second songs, and indeed, as we have seen, still more fully in the fourth, to become the light of the heathen and to carry to them, as the servant and ambassador of Yahweh, the true religion—this is announced in 51:4 f. as the purpose of Yahweh himself, in closest connection, moreover, with the salvation and redemption which Yahweh's arm is to bring about—all this corresponding exactly to the portrayal of its *fulfilment* in the two following and closely connected chaps. 52, 53. It is not expressly stated here whom Yahweh has selected to be the human agency for this enlightenment of the heathen; but when in vs. 7 the people of Israel⁴² is addressed as "the people in whose heart is my *thorah*,"

⁴⁰ Duhm proceeds altogether arbitrarily when he interprets זָרִיעַ in 53:1 as "divine activity itself," visible only to the initiated, and in 52:10 (read thus instead of 12) as the effect of this activity, which is to be visible to all.

⁴¹ Within these two points are the passages referring to the suffering *people* (Israel), 52:5, 3; 51:22 f., 12, to which Sellin (p. 101) has rightly called attention.

⁴² There is no reason for thinking only of the elect, although, so far as concerns the question here under consideration, this interpretation would serve the same purpose.

when the promise is given in vs. 4, "*Thorah* shall *proceed* from me and my *mishpat* for a light of the people," it is certainly clear that the agent chosen by Yahweh for the work is none other than this people in whose heart is his *thorah*. Moreover, the forms of expression in 51:4 correspond exactly to those in 42:1,4, in the first "Ebed-Yahweh song." And when finally we compare 51:7 f. with the "song" 50:4-9, just preceding it, no other conclusion is possible than that the people in 51:7 is none other than the servant of the "songs." What the servant says of himself in 50:4-9, Yahweh in 51:7 f. addresses as an encouragement to the people. Corresponding to 50:4 f., in which the servant glories in his position as Yahweh's pupil, receiving his instruction, we have in the following chapter, vs. 7, "Ye that know righteousness (צִדִּיק), the people in whose heart my *thorah* is." Corresponding to the servant's statement in 50:6, that he has patiently endured all revilings and abuse, we have in 51:7b the admonition to the people not to fear the reproach and revilings of men.⁴³ In 50:7-9a the servant expresses his confidence in the help of Yahweh, and in 51:8b that help is vouchsafed to the people. Corresponding to the servant's certainty in 50:9b, that all his adversaries shall wax old as a garment and shall be eaten up by the moth, we find in 51:8a⁴⁴ exactly the same expression, in the promise which is given to the people. Nothing could be more evident than that the servant of Yahweh in 50:4-9 is neither more nor less than the personification of the people, and that in his joyful testimony he

⁴³ In distinguishing between the servant of Deutero-Isaiah and the servant of the songs, Duhm (p. 285) includes in his definition of the latter the idea that he suffers from the revilings of unbelievers (his fellow-countrymen), and not, like Israel, at the hands of foreign oppressors. This can apply only to 50:6, since Duhm sees in chap. 53 only leprosy. Laue also says (p. 28): "It seems certain that his countrymen are the ones who maltreat the servant." But in the חֲרַפְתָּ אִנּוּשׁ, 51:7, we have the same generality of expression, so that here also a similar conclusion would be valid. Now it is self-evident, of course, that if in 50:4 ff. the people is represented as an individual, the nations which ill-treat it must also be represented in the same manner, and that such ill-treatment must, in consequence, assume a very personal character. The inference that fellow-countrymen of the servant are referred to in chap. 50 is, therefore, entirely unfounded. Moreover, the general expressions used in 51:7 are explained in 51:12 f. by מַצִּיק, "the foreign oppressor," so that for this passage also the same meaning is secured.

⁴⁴ With 50:9b cf. also 51:6.

simply represents as accomplished the things to which Yahweh still finds it necessary to exhort the people. Such an exhortation we find in 51: 1-3, the passage immediately following the third "song."

The case of this song is thus a peculiar one. In it Yahweh's servant (although not called by that name) corresponds exactly, even in his blindness and deafness, to the conception of the servant in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, as Kittel, for example, sums it up (p. 379), "protected, comforted, freed by Yahweh, but himself passive," and not at all to the conception of the servant in the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," concerning which Kittel says: "Here he appears in an independent activity, carries the thorah to the heathen, and redeems his people." Not the slightest suggestion of the latter ideas is to be found in this song.

No wonder, then, that Ley and Laue have struck this song out of the series of four; and yet it is not so easily disposed of as might seem at first sight. For although there is no mention in it of a mission to the heathen, and although the punishment of the adversaries is directly opposed to that idea, still the fact that the speaker in 50: 4-9 is so thoroughly saturated with Yahweh's teachings and inspiration provides the prerequisite and preparation for his carrying the thorah to the heathen; and the relation between vs. 4 and vs. 7 of chap. 51, to which I have already called attention, is clearly such that it must have been thought of and intended by the author. Nor can we disregard the literary form. If the theory of the separate origin of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" is to be held, it is exceedingly dangerous to concede that in the book itself other persons can be introduced as speakers, in the same way as the servant in 49: 1 ff. It is doubtless because of his perception of this fact that Laue declares that the passage has been *artificially formed* into an "Ebed-Yahweh song." He does not say how much of it he attributes to the reviser, whether the latter has changed the form or the contents, or both. But his supposition presents grave difficulties. Any writer who intended deliberately to add a fourth song to the other three would certainly have made his purpose very clear. He would scarcely have neglected to insert the name "servant

of Yahweh," perhaps in the form of an assurance such as appears in 49: 3, and to assign to him duties and work such as are mentioned in 42: 1 ff. and 49: 1 ff. And are we to suppose that he would have introduced the first personal pronoun "I," thus making the servant the speaker? We should be tempted to ask, then, what there is really left of the original passage. There is very little likelihood, therefore, that Ley and Laue will find many followers, particularly since the share of the author of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" becomes a very meager one, if we subtract this passage, and with Bertholet 53: 1-11 as well, not to mention Schian, Kusters, and Laue, who, in addition to these, omit 52: 13—53: 12 entire. But if we would avoid Laue's conclusion, we shall be obliged to admit the intimate relation, demonstrated above, between the passage under discussion and the rest of the book, together with the inferences resulting from such relation.⁴⁵ It is clear, at any rate, that all the statements made in 50: 4-9 by the servant are applied in 51: 1-8 to the people.

CHAP. 49: 1-6.

Let us go back now to the second "Ebed-Yahweh song," 49: 1-6, which is separated from the third by comparatively short passages. This brings us to the passage which has of late been alleged to be of itself and alone sufficient ground for rejecting the interpretation of the servant of the "songs" as the entire people of Israel. Bertholet, opposing this view (p. 6), appeals, along with Isa. 53, to 49: 5, and then quotes what Schian says (p. 24): "For however we may explain these words, we cannot get away from the fact that they speak of an active influence of the servant upon Israel." In Laue (p. 14) we read: "But this verse places beyond all doubt that the Ebed as speaker is distinguished in some manner or other (to express myself cautiously) from the nation as a whole, . . . as the one affected by his action;" whereupon this commentator appeals (p. 41; cf. 28) very confidently to the exegesis of the case, without, however, developing the latter. Sellin says (p. 104): "Now, it is perfectly

⁴⁵In this connection cf. also Laue and Ley, although neither of them appreciates the exact import of the facts.

clear that in 49:5 f. the Ebed is plainly distinguished from the whole people, and therefore from the righteous part of it as well." But after we have been convinced that the individual interpretation of chap. 53 is impossible, and the reference of the term "servant" to the people is the necessary view, we shall not be inclined to overestimate the importance of such an interdict based only upon a single passage. At any rate, these verses merit a much more minute examination than they have received since Duhm, who devotes an extended discussion to them.

It is an exceedingly important fact, in the first place, that in 49:1 the servant immediately addresses himself, not to Israel, but to the nations. Therefore, what he has to say applies to them. Furthermore, the servant, directly after his first address, harks back to the time of his birth. Even from his birth Yahweh had called him and equipped him for his calling, by which is meant the preaching of the word. For the servant's mouth is his sharp sword (*2aβ*), and the shaft in *2ba* must be interpreted in the same way. But the servant is not to enter upon his calling at once; until the right time shall come Yahweh has hid him in his quiver (*2bβ*), and in the meantime covers him in the shadow of his protecting hand (*2aβ*).⁴⁶ The time shall come when Yahweh shall be glorified through him⁴⁷ whom he calls his servant. Here he calls him not only "my servant," but also "Israel," and this, for us, would settle the case. But many have long since evaded this conclusion by striking out *ישראל*⁴⁸ in the face of all the translations and on the strength of only a single manuscript.⁴⁹ This is the last extreme measure, which, according to accepted scientific methods, should not be resorted to unless all other reasons make such a course compulsory. But we cannot rely

⁴⁶ Cf. 51:16, where the same thing is plainly stated of the people. Hence Duhm is compelled to strike out this verse as a gloss, while Laue regards it as a misplaced gloss of an Ebed-Yahweh song.

⁴⁷ The equipment for future activity in vs. 2 precludes the possibility of translating "in whom I will be glorified."

⁴⁸ This was done by J. D. Michaelis, then by Gesenius, who afterward reinstated it as genuine (cf. Hitzig *ad loc.*), and latterly by all those against whom this paper is directed.

⁴⁹ Kennicott 96.

solely on evidence contained in the verse itself. It must be remembered that, according to vs. 1, we are here carried back to Israel's cradle; that, according to the tradition contained in Gen. 32:29, Israel is a significant name of honor, given by Yahweh to the people in their ancestor Jacob. Above all things must it be remembered that the servant is here addressing the heathen (1*a*), to whom he is under obligation to state his name, as would not be the case were he an Israelite, addressing his own people. There is, therefore, not the slightest necessity for "desperate expedients of interpretation" (Duhm). **יִשְׂרָאֵל** is simply the second predicate of **אַתָּה**: "Thou art Israel through whom I will be glorified."

But this future, in which the glorification is to come to pass, has seemed to the servant to be so long in coming that he has sometimes experienced a despondency, which he has had to overcome by calling to mind the reasons for encouragement (vs. 4). Now, however, this time has arrived, as expressed by **וְעַתָּה** in vs. 5, and to Yahweh's words spoken to him in ancient times (vs. 3) he adds what Yahweh has imparted to him *now*. Accordingly, only that portion which concerns the heathen, to whom the entire speech is addressed, can be regarded as the new revelation, yet to be realized, of which the servant speaks. In reality, it is quite clear that vs. 5 forms no part of this revelation. For the **וַיֹּאמֶר** in vs. 6 simply takes up again the **אָמַר** of the preceding verse, vs. 5 being nothing more than a single extended characterization of the subject Yahweh: "Yahweh who formed me from the womb to be his servant, etc." In the words which now follow is supposed to lie the proof that the servant cannot be the equivalent for the people of Israel; the succeeding infinitive clause is almost invariably paraphrased, "in order that *I* may bring Jacob again to him," and by the aid of this interpretation it is attempted to prove that the servant has a mission to Israel, and that he is, therefore, distinguished from Israel. But it seems to me that those who base such far-reaching conclusions upon this explanation of the verse are at least in duty bound to mention the possibility of another explanation, not to say refute it. Hitzig takes Yahweh, and

not the servant, as the subject of the infinitive. "Not gerundive and action of Yahweh (Hitzig)"—so is the matter tersely disposed of in Dillmann-Kittel; Schian simply remarks that this interpretation makes no sense;⁵⁰ in the rest of the most recent commentators I have been unable to discover any mention of this explanation of the infinitive. And yet it is in the main identical with Duhm's, who proves it to be necessary by the next following clause. He adds, to be sure, that, even if Yahweh is regarded as the subject, the servant still remains the instrument, the teacher, comforter, etc. But this cannot be admitted without proof. Formally it would necessitate construing the infinitive as a clause of purpose: Yahweh formed the servant in order (thereby, that is, by the servant) to do this and that. But what? Duhm concedes, in regard to **לֹא יִאָסֶה** (so he reads, following the Kētîb), that this is primarily Yahweh's work; on **שׁוֹבֵב**, on the other hand, he says that, unlike **הַשִּׁיב**, it is to be understood in a figurative sense as a spiritual leading back to God by instruction, exhortation, and comfort. He cannot prove this by 47:10 (read thus instead of 12), because he attributes this chapter to another author. But, aside from this, we cannot compare these entirely different uses. There are no other proofs available, but in Ezek. 39:27 and Jer. 50:19⁵¹ **שׁוֹבֵב** is used to express the bringing home of Israel out of exile, exactly as **הַשִּׁיב** is used elsewhere, *e. g.*, in Ezek. 29:14; 34:4, so that the presence of the two forms side by side in vss. 5 and 6 is not at all surprising. In the following clause the reading **לֹא יִאָסֶה** means, "in order that Israel may not be swept away," an exceedingly clumsy and questionable construction. The Kěre **לֹא**—a parallel and alternative to **אֵלֶיךָ** (so also in a number of MSS. and most versions)—is by all means preferable. Then, however, **יִאָסֶה** is not to be punctuated as Niphal, but as **קָל יִאָסֶה**;

⁵⁰ P. 24. The omission of the second quotation mark in l. 8 after "erstrecken" gives the impression that this clause, too, belongs to Duhm.

⁵¹ In this way also the passive is used in Ezek. 38:8, at least essentially so. These are three out of the twelve passages in which we find **שׁוֹבֵב**. It is well known that **הַשִּׁיב** is also employed in a figurative sense. Still the exact meaning which Duhm insists upon cannot be proved in any of them. Cf. in this connection also SELLIN, pp. 156 f.

Yahweh gathers Israel to himself, draws it to him.⁵² Only in this way is the construction good and natural; but then the necessity for taking Yahweh as the subject of both clauses is at once proven. If these were clauses of purpose, no doubt they would have to be taken as referring to Israel's being brought back out of captivity, and the conception would be that Yahweh had formed the servant to be instrumental in this work. This could not apply, it is true, to Duhm's teacher of the law, nor to that class of teachers (as Berthelot holds), nor to the heart of the nation, although it might perhaps apply to Sellin's Zerubbabel.⁵³ But we are as yet dealing only with the subject, not with the predicate; not with what is to happen, but with what has long since happened. Hitzig's explanation as a gerundive is, therefore, in my judgment, the only correct one.⁵⁴ Now, it certainly implies a contradiction if we read: "that formed me from the womb to be his servant, in that he brought Jacob (out of Babylonian captivity) again to him." Neither at that time nor ever did Yahweh do that. And when, moreover, we consider the fact that not until vs. 6 is there mention made of "raising up the tribes of Jacob and restoring the preserved of Israel"⁵⁵ (note the remarkably different manner of expression, strongly emphasizing Israel's deterioration), we get for vs. 5 an entirely different meaning. The act is one which lays the foundations of Israel, and 5*a*, *b* must be read, "in that he brought Jacob again (out of Egypt) to him, and drew Israel to him (into the desert)." This is confirmed in the succeeding statements: **וְאָנֹכְרָ בְעֵינֵי יְהוָה וְאֵלֹהֵי הָיָה עֲדֵי**,⁵⁶

⁵² Here the punctuation of the Kētib (with **לֹא**) has been substituted for that of the Kērē (with **לֹךְ**), probably because the old, correct interpretation of Yahweh as subject was afterward altogether discarded.

⁵³ Cf. SELLIN, pp. 157 ff. Here Sheshbazzar still gives him some difficulty.

⁵⁴ Claimed, for example, by Duhm for 42 : 7. He also claims this interpretation of the infinitive in respect to the subject for 49 : 8*b*, 9, and Dillmann-Kittel for 51 : 16.

⁵⁵ There is every reason to emphasize the name Jacob, and not to explain the passage of any act of founding previous to Jacob's time. Jacob it was who went down to Egypt, and who in his descendants was brought back again. Then, without a doubt, vs. 5 f. correspond accurately to 52 : 4, where the Egyptian captivity, being the first, is set over against the Assyrian, with which the Babylonian is associated.

⁵⁶ The **וְ** consecutive is, as is well known, and as Klostermann especially has shown, often misunderstood by those who pointed the text of Deutero-Isaiah. That this is the case here is proven by the following **וְהָיָה**.

which are entirely out of place if the preceding clause applies to future time.⁵⁷ Rightly interpreted, vs. 5*a* represents the whole period of Israel's happy existence in the promised land, in which the people experienced the favor of Yahweh; in introducing the newly received promise, the servant surveys Yahweh's entire dealings with him. Thus it becomes evident that vs. 5, so far from opposing, expressly confirms the identity of the servant with the people of Israel, and every argument for striking out *ישראל* in vs. 3 disappears. And now vs. 6 easily explains itself: "It is too light a thing to me that thou shouldest be my servant, inasmuch as I raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel; rather will I give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may extend to the ends of the earth." Thus the sentence agrees with what we have been expecting from the beginning. The salvation of Israel is not a new promise; it has long since been assured and is presupposed. But concerning the heathen the promise is new, and is here for the first time proclaimed to them. The conception of the servant is thus broadened. Henceforth he is not to be simply the suffering and receptive one, but, over and above that, active and creative; he is not merely to be the slave of Yahweh, even though the preferred and beloved one, but he is to be his co-worker and assistant in a work of world-wide scope. The verse, therefore, distinctly refutes the erroneous view that where the servant of Yahweh represents the people of Israel, he plays in Deutero-Isaiah only a passive part, and in the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" only an active one. Here one and the same author expressly appropriates these two conceptions, and this fact proves that they belong to one subject. This shows as plainly as it could be done that he is the author of the passages in which the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" are imbedded. Of course, my interpretation of 49:5 f. is not necessary as a premise of the refutation of the false view above referred to; for is not the passive, receptive attitude of the servant undoubtedly present also in vs. 2, as well as in 50:4 ff., and in the whole of chap.

⁵⁷ Duhm noticed this fact, and accordingly placed 5*b* immediately after vs. 3, where it is more than ever out of place.

53 ? This is, indeed, self-evident ; for how could there be a servant of Yahweh who could dispense with Yahweh's protection and care ?

But, on the other hand, the other side of the conception of the servant, his active qualities, appear also in the rest of the book. The proclamation to the heathen ends with vs. 6 (chap. 49), and now it is no longer the servant himself who speaks, but the prophet, who introduces a new promise from Yahweh to the servant, thereby confirming what the latter has just reported. Again, as in vs. 5, the introduction itself is of the greatest importance. Here the person spoken to is not addressed as the servant of Yahweh, but as the servant of tyrants.⁵⁸ This alone would indicate that the reference is to a people, and this reference is placed beyond all doubt by the epithet "Redeemer of Israel" with which Yahweh is introduced. And yet, Yahweh's speech contains in condensed form everything that is said of his servant in 52 : 14 f., the former being understood, of course, to include its necessary presupposition, the servant's conscious and unconscious activity in behalf of the heathen. It is merely a desperate expedient when Duhm maintains that the idea of this activity is excluded from the passage under discussion because there is no mention of a restoration to life. In so condensed an account of the final result, such an omission might easily occur, even if the servant in both places represented an individual. But as he represents the people of Israel, the restoration to life merely signifies the release from the bondage of the tyrants, which is spoken of in vs. 7. The relation of vss. 7 ff. to vss. 1-6 is simply as follows : In vss. 1-6 the *servant* announces to the *world of nations* that Yahweh has promised him a successful mission to them ; in vss. 7 ff. Yahweh informs the *servant* of the honor and blessing which he shall receive (as a result of this successful work), and so it is quite correct to say that vss. 1-6 are not merely repeated in vss. 7 ff.,⁵⁹ but the latter passage is not intelligible without the former. It

⁵⁸ Besides this we must read לַבְּיָהּ and לַמְּהַרְבֵּי, and perhaps also אֲנִי instead of נָפִישׁ.

⁵⁹ Cf. SMEND, *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 260 ; KITTEL, *Kommentar*, p. 427. Sellin on p. 100 shows that he recognizes the close connection of the two passages.

is, therefore, impossible to understand why Kittel should find it necessary to warn us against an "artificial welding together" of the two pieces. Those who, following the lead of Smend,⁶⁰ consider 49:7 ff. an interpolation for the purpose of connecting the Ebed-Yahweh song with Deutero-Isaiah show more insight. But whether here and elsewhere the connecting sections are attributed to Deutero-Isaiah or to a third author, those who find themselves compelled to adopt such questionable suppositions must first have made a forced cleavage between the "songs" and the rest of the book, occasioned by a false interpretation of the servant. Since Duhm, the originator of the entire movement, simply denies all connection between the songs and what follows them, the acceptance of such connecting sections means neither more nor less than that the theory as first proposed has been wrecked on the rock of facts, and that it would need to possess most extraordinary merits of another sort in order to justify such a subsequent reconstruction for the sake of retaining it.⁶¹

CHAP. 42: 1-7.

Without dwelling further upon details of interpretation, let us now go back from chap. 49 to the last of the four passages, 42:1-7, which in the order of the series is the first. It is remarkable, as Sellin suggests, that these two songs are separated by so long an interval, but this fact requires no artificial hypotheses to explain it, because the intervening passages, being chiefly polemical in character, representing the strife with the idols and with Babylon, easily and naturally extend to this length.

In respect to 42: 1-4, so far as the material itself is concerned, there is entire unanimity. The servant, whoever he may be, is to carry religion to the heathen, the only true religion, that of Yahweh.⁶² He is of a gentle and quiet disposition, forbearing

⁶⁰ *Alttest. Theol.*, pp. 370 f.

⁶¹ Duhm and Astruc stand in about the same relation to their respective successors. It is, however, a great mistake to assume at once that the phenomena which characterize the compilation of sources in the historical books are simply repeated in the prophetic books.

⁶² Only in this way can the absolute **משפט**, which only occurs here, be explained. Cf. **משפטי**, 51:4, and also Jer. 5:4; 8:7; 2 Kings 17:27.

and patient, and will not become weary until the nations⁶³ shall sit teachable at his feet. Here the independent activity of the servant receives greater prominence than in chaps. 49, 50, and 53, where his protection, preservation, and suffering are more strongly emphasized. And yet his characteristics are the same, although turned in the opposite direction, and everything that is stated in those passages is here foreshadowed and predicted. But again we ask in vain how such things could be stated of an individual; Isa. 2:2-4 alone is sufficient evidence of the existence of the conception that Israel has a mission of instruction to the heathen. The next verses (42:5-7) also prove that this is the only possible interpretation of the servant. For, in whatever way we may explain the difficult **וְאַתָּנָךְ לְבְרִית עִם**⁶⁴ in vs. 6, in any case it can apply only to the people, and not to an individual.⁶⁵ And at the same time the statement is made concerning this people that Yahweh will make it the light of the heathen; precisely the same, therefore, which is said of the people in 49:6; 51:4, and in 42:1-4, of the servant of the "songs." For anyone who is not utterly blind, this again proves the equation: servant of Yahweh = people of Israel. It is one of those bold strokes of which Duhm's commentary contains so many, when he gives to **לְאֹר גִּוִּים** an interpretation different not only from that in 49:6, which he attributes to another author, but different also from that in 51:4, where he admits the same Deutero-Isaiah. "The theocracy is the pattern for the other states. As is shown by what follows, this is not a principal thought, but merely an additional idea which is intended to emphasize the glory of the theocracy." Then it would seem that **לְאֹר גִּוִּים** does not depend at all upon **וְאַתָּנָךְ**, but upon **בְּרִית עִם**, and not the person addressed, but his reorganization as a nation, constitutes the light; so that we are no longer dealing with an active bringing

אֵימ, הָאֵרֶץ⁶³.

⁶⁴ The correct translation, in my opinion, is "to make [the subject] of a people's covenant," *i. e.*, to make a covenant with the scattered and dispersed people of Israel as with a nation; in other words, to reestablish it as a people and at the same time renew its covenant. We have simply to deal, therefore, with a pregnant construction.

⁶⁵ The interpretation of **בְּרִית** as "mediator of the covenant," which Sellin has again adopted, is, and always will be, impossible.

in of the light, but only, as it were, with a mechanical reflection of it. Not only does Duhm in this explanation fail to mention the parallel passages 49:6; 51:4, but I do not find that this interpretation is even referred to by any of the adherents of his view, which is the best possible evidence that his views in this connection are generally conceded to be impossible. Since Smend it has been common instead to explain these verses, like 49:7 ff., as a connecting link with vss. 1-4. I have already sufficiently characterized this interpretation. Moreover, these verses are not at all essential to prove that the servant is identical with the people.⁶⁶

Against all this, 42:18 ff. is said to constitute a second conclusive proof (49:5 f. being the first) that the Ebed of the "songs" cannot be the same servant whom we find in Deutero-Isaiah, namely, the people of Israel. Upon this chiefly is based Duhm's portrayal of Deutero-Isaiah's servant (p. 284): "He represents Israel in its present condition as the servant of Yahweh, chosen and protected by Yahweh, and destined by him to a glorious future, but at present blind and deaf, captive and despoiled, a worm, despised of the heathen and full of sins."⁶⁷ As I have already stated, one of his followers, Sellin,⁶⁸ questions his right to use the passage thus, and sees, on the contrary, in vss. 19-21, 23 (he places vs. 22 after vs. 23), a fifth "Ebed-Yahweh song," in which also the reference is to an individual and not to a collective conception. He is quite right in saying that in vs. 19 the form of expression is as individualistic as anywhere in the "songs;"

⁶⁶ On the other hand, attention may be called to the fact that Yahweh's two promises—to make Israel *עם ברית* and *אור גוים*—occurring in such close proximity, are very difficult to harmonize, especially without a *ו* to distinguish them. The question arises whether one of them is not an insertion. In deciding which one may have been inserted, vs. 7 would be very important, although formally the interpolation of *עם לברית* from the passage 49:8 would offer the most easy explanation.

⁶⁷ Only this last trait, "full of sins," has probably been borrowed from elsewhere; since Duhm with great insight strikes out 42:24 from *והלא*, believing it to be a deuteronomic gloss. But even in view of 43:24 ff. and 50:1, the expression "full of sins" is rather too strong.

⁶⁸ *Serubbabel*, pp. 107 f., 178, and especially 216.

for this reason he believes a reference to the people to be impossible. But the claim that "blind and deaf" in vs. 19 need not be taken as the expression of an ethico-religious defect, but simply as a statement that the servant has undergone suffering in his exile, just as the figure of darkness is used to designate the land of exile, is hazardous in the extreme. For in vs. 20 responsibility for his blindness and deafness is charged in unequivocal words to the servant himself: with seeing eyes he observes not, and with open ears he hears not; and vs. 21 says just as distinctly that, despite his infirmities, Yahweh has destined him for great things, not for his own, but for Yahweh's sake. He is called to exalt and glorify the *thorah*. It is radically wrong to follow Duhm in interpreting the word *חוריה* here in a strictly deuteronomic sense, and then to question the genuineness of the verse. On the contrary, we know from 51:4 that *חוריה* is simply synonymous with *משפט* in the same sense of "religion" (*cf.* also Isa. 2:2-4), and thus again, as in vss. 1-4, the expression can be interpreted only as referring to the dissemination of Yahweh's religion among the heathen. Here, then, according to a certain school, the servant would again appear as an individual. But immediately following we have a second obstacle in the way of his call, the fact, namely, that the servant is a despised, despoiled, and captive *people*. Sellin thinks the prophet is here returning to the collective conception of the servant; but how in the world could he identify both conceptions in the one word *חוריה*? Nor does the transposition which Sellin proposes help the matter. The dire confusion will admit of no solution, so long as distinctions once adopted and enacted are tenaciously adhered to. This ever-advancing process of analysis will not content itself with raising the questions which it has already suggested, but will sweep away the entire passage, a work of incomparable beauty, as a piece of patchwork based upon misunderstandings.

On the other hand, everything becomes clear when we admit that the prophet has adhered throughout to his purpose of representing the people by the servant of Yahweh. Then the simple solution may be found in Duhm's own characterization, as

literally quoted above. The servant as representing the people is "destined to a glorious future, but at present is blind, deaf," etc. And accordingly, if two contrasting phases of disposition and conduct appear in his nature, why should we be surprised to find a detailed portrayal of both? What reason have we for obstinately refusing to acknowledge the inner unity of the two, or venturing to tear asunder what legitimately belongs together? If the servant were an individual, the question might arise whether in *one* person and in *one* human life such contrasting phases of character could be found combined. But in the case of a people such a combination cannot occasion surprise. A people, and particularly the people of Israel, has a long history, in the course of which it experiences varying conditions, without, however, losing its undivided personality. Our prophet looks back to the legendary beginnings of his nation, back to Abraham and Sarah (41: 8 f.; 51: 2). In those times Yahweh called it to be his servant, and his servant it has remained until the present day. But in this long period of time it has by no means maintained and conducted itself with unvarying blamelessness as Yahweh's servant. In times past it committed grievous sins, and has thereby brought punishment upon itself. At present it is blind and deaf, in that it will not or cannot hear the decrees of Yahweh announced to it by the prophet; it is fearful and intimidated, in that it overestimates the power of the enemy and lacks the right confidence in the omnipotence and grace of its God; but, in spite of all this, it does not cease to be Yahweh's servant, for no one else has a claim upon the nation (50: 1 ff.). This prophet is able to reveal to the people for the first time the full significance of its title, and only in time to come will that significance be fully realized in the people. It culminates in the mission to win the nations for Yahweh, to preach his religion to the heathen, and only in the light of these things can the sufferings of the people in the present and recent past be rightly understood.

As a matter of fact, the only enemies with which Deutero-Isaiah has to contend, and against which he struggles with all available means, are faint-heartedness, fear, and indolence. And

as one of these means shall we not allow him to contrast the Israel of the future, happy and well-pleasing to God, with the Israel of the present, in its fallen and abnormal condition? The contrast is not, as some have supposed, between the heart of the nation, well-pleasing to God, and the masses, nor between the ideal of the people and its actual status. What is meant is rather the entire nation and the actual nation, as it must and shall be when the fulness of the prophet's promises shall be realized. That such is the case these "songs" themselves show with remarkable clearness. In 49:4 the servant confesses how faint-hearted he formerly was,⁶⁹ and in 50:7-9 we can also read between the lines how much he has needed help to keep him from despair.⁷⁰ Finally, in this passage (50:4 ff.), and particularly in 52:13-53:12, all the misery of his unfortunate past, of his disgraceful ruin and subsequent dishonorable life among the heathen, finds its complete expression.

When viewed in this light, the relation of 42:18 ff. to what precedes seems perfectly simple and unobjectionable. In vss. 1-7 the activity of the servant in his calling is portrayed; everything is represented as taking place in the future, and the climax is reached in his becoming the light of the heathen. *The eyes of the blind shall be opened*, the captives are to be released from prison.⁷¹ This is followed in vss. 10 ff. by an exhortation to a song of triumph in which Yahweh's victory is celebrated, and in vss. 14 ff. by an expression of Yahweh's impatience to see this triumph speedily realized. The (innocently) *blind* are assured of safe guidance, while those who defiantly cling to their idols (which by no means refers to *all* those still living in heathendom) are to be put to shame. Then, in vs. 18, there comes a call to the

⁶⁹ Vs. 4b expresses, by way of contrast, his present better insight, and is in no sense a continuation of the statement of his former thoughts which begins with *וְאֵנִי אֲמַרְתִּי*.

⁷⁰ Smend asks, p. 257: Where *in the past* could the Israel have been found which would have patiently endured the abuse and scorn of the world *while proclaiming the truth to the heathen*? It must be remembered that up to this song at least the preaching of the servant has consisted largely of that patience which is here praised, and, above all things, that here too that which is described as past is really future.

⁷¹ Yahweh most probably remains the subject of the infinitives in vs. 7, and the blind and captive are the heathen who are to receive the light.

blind and deaf. And not until now does it become apparent that none is more completely blind and deaf than this same servant through whose agency all these deeds are to be accomplished. He neither heeds nor understands the purpose for which he has been called, nor yet the reason of his suffering. Thus the hearer is transported from the glorious future to the far different present, and now, in chap. 43, begins anew the work of making faint-hearted Israel willing and able to fulfil its mission. I cannot comprehend why Deutero-Isaiah should in consequence deserve the reproachful title of "the strangest writer in the world,"⁷² who does not by a single syllable, or by any variation of tense, indicate that here he has in mind the present and there the future. But are not all the tenses in 42:1-4 and 14-17 future, and in vss. 6 f. and 21 perfect, wherever the old calling is referred to; and perfect again in vss. 22, 24 f., where Israel's deliverance to suffering and bondage is mentioned? In vs. 19 the nominal clauses *מִי עוֹר*, etc., show that the present is meant, while in vs. 20 Duham himself by accepting the perfect *רָאִיתִי* draws a distinction between past experiences and continued failure to make proper use of them. Wherein the author has blundered in this matter is, in fact, impossible to discover. And, moreover, in vs. 19 he says expressly: "Who is so deaf as my messenger *whom I will send*."⁷³ Surely this could not refer more unmistakably to the calling of the servant in vs. 1, "he *shall carry forth* religion to the heathen," nor could it call attention more plainly to the contradiction existing between the servant's appointed mission and his present conduct. Not often in the history of exegesis have clear waters been so unwisely made turbid as has been done by the assertion of the inharmoniousness of vss. 18 ff. with vss. 1-4. If those who have created for themselves the conception of the servant as an individual are determined tenaciously to cling to it, then there is no other recourse than the knife of criticism, and the foregoing evidences for the opposite view must also be forcibly removed.⁷⁴

⁷² DUHAM, p. 292.

⁷³ Translating it as a present does not help the matter.

⁷⁴ I should not like to overlook entirely a counter-argument to which Sellin attaches great importance. He says (p. 108) concerning 43:10: "If in this passage anyone

Let us return now to 42:1, where the servant of the "songs" is first introduced. How is he introduced? I find the generally prevalent view most forcibly expressed by Laue;⁷⁵ still he may reasonably be taken as the representative of all. "Everyone," so he says, "who carefully reads the Ebed-Yahweh passages must be struck with the fact that in them the Ebed is spoken of, it is true, but that this Ebed appears *anonymously*. With unmistakable certainty Deutero-Isaiah applies to Israel and Jacob (Isa. 41:8, etc.), *i. e.*, to the people as a whole, the honorary title Ebed. . . . In other words: so much must be conceded, namely, that the Ebed passages do not claim to contain the same conception of the Ebed as does the rest of the book; they leave the reader free to form a different conception of the Ebed." This cannot be for a moment admitted, for its exact opposite is true. When an author introduces a new designation, we rightly demand that, at the place where he first makes use of it, he shall adequately define and explain its meaning. But, having *once* done this, he may demand of the intelligent reader that the latter shall from this equation find for himself the value of x in the subsequent passages, that is to say, that he shall understand this designation wherever it may afterward occur, in the sense in which it was first explained; no one can impose upon the author the obligation to repeat such explanation with every use of the term. Precisely so, in the first passage where the servant of Yahweh is mentioned, in 41:8, Deutero-Isaiah has explained the appellation by "Israel" and "Jacob," and by reference to Abraham's calling

is determined to ignore the fact that Deutero-Isaiah in his speeches sometimes draws a distinction between the servant and the people, then it simply shows how blind one can be made by preconceived opinions." He interprets the verse, "Ye [my people] and my servant [the single great individual who is to spread abroad the knowledge of the thorah] are both my witnesses before the heathen," and thinks that the other interpretation, "Ye [the people] are my witnesses and are my servant whom I have chosen," is nonsense. But it is not nonsense, according to what we have just seen. Chap. 42 tells us that the servant is the one who has been called to work among the heathen. Therefore Israel is primarily Yahweh's witness, that is, *in a position* to support his cause; but, in the next place, Israel is also his servant, that is, *called and obligated* to this mission. The other advocates of the "songs" will scarcely care to avail themselves of this remark by Sellin.

⁷⁵ P. 14.

has placed it beyond all doubt that the whole people of Israel as such is meant. If, therefore, he had thereafter used the name without the insertion of such definition, we as readers, should still have been in duty bound to interpret it according to his first explanation. To speak of an anonymous appearing of this servant would, even in this case, have been wide of the mark. But, in fact, Deutero-Isaiah repeats the explanation again and again—in 42:19-22; 43:10;⁷⁶ 44:1, 21; 45:4; 48:20—and thus makes it still more inevitable that we should interpret in the same way the passages which contain no such explanation. Between the first and second passages, which I have just mentioned, and which are not separated by any great interval, comes the first "Ebed-Yahweh song," and right after the last one the second song. How, then, can we speak of an anonymous introduction of the servant? It is simply a case of a *circulus vitiosus*: "We have severed the Ebed-Yahweh songs from the context, and have assigned them to a different author; therefore the explanation given in those passages cannot hold good for him." Even from the point of view of *this* theory it should rather be argued that, since the songs are inserted into the structure of the book, they *ought* to be interpreted, on the strength of 41:8, etc., not as speaking of an individual, but of the people of Israel. This would imply, either that the interpolator—according to this theory—himself conceived them thus, or, at any rate, that he considered this explanation easily possible. Of the two ideas the former is decidedly the more probable. In either case we should have a very old testimony in support of our interpretation of the "songs."

But let us make another and a closer examination of the songs themselves. If any doubt still remained, the wording of 42:1a would suffice to prove that the servant of 41:8 is meant, and none other. With **אשר בחרתיך** compare **בחרירי** in 41:8; with **אתמך בו** compare **תמכתיך** in 41:10. In the same way 49:3a has a parallel in 41:9b; 49:1b a parallel in 41:8, 9a; and 50:7-9 in 41:10 f. But the explanation itself, the name Israel, also occurs, as we have seen, in 49:3. Its excision from

⁷⁶ Cf. note 74.

this verse springs from the determination to maintain another explanation. It is true that the text of the LXX in 42:1 is claimed as a basis for this, it being asserted that, as in 42:1 **יַעֲקֹב** has crept in before **עַבְדִּי** and **יִשְׂרָאֵל** before **בַּחֲרִירִי**, so it has undoubtedly happened in 49:3. If this were the case, we should still have to recognize in these added words a very old exegesis, and that, too, one which can be shown to be, at least essentially, correct. But we have seen that there is every reason to believe that **יִשְׂרָאֵל** is genuine in 49:3. And in 42:1 the LXX has just as valid claims to correctness as the massoretic text. On the whole, the vividly individualistic forms of expression in the passages under discussion have led, both in later antiquity and at the present day, much more to the misunderstanding that an individual must be meant, and it is not easy to believe that conversely the text should have been changed in favor of the opposite conception, the collective one. In all probability **יַעֲקֹב** and **יִשְׂרָאֵל** in 42:1 are genuine. I have no doubt that this will be attacked on metrical grounds, but the excision of **יִשְׂרָאֵל** in 49:3 interferes much more seriously with the meter.

Finally, however, the name Israel has been preserved in the fourth song also, fortunately, by corruption or intentional alteration, protected against critical excision. The "song" begins in 52:13 with the words, **הִנֵּה יֹשְׁבֵי עַבְדִּי**. No manner of twisting or turning will satisfactorily account for the word **יֹשְׁבֵי**. After the preceding passage has furnished us with a complete account of all the servant's activity and experience, there remains no room for any other *statement* than that which from **יָרוּם** on is made no less than three times, namely, that the servant shall be exalted; least of all is there room for anything that could be expressed by **יֹשְׁבֵי**.⁷⁷ Nor can we justify the presence of the three synonymous verbs in any other way than by assuming that **יָרוּם** forms the conclusion of the first line, and that the other two reiterate the idea in climactic parallel. But with this arrangement, **יֹשְׁבֵי** becomes entirely impossible,

⁷⁷ This disposes also of Sellin's explanation on the basis of Jer. 23:5 (p. 169), although the **יֹשְׁבֵי** may have been influenced from that source.

a fact which has prompted Duhm simply to strike out the word without giving a second thought to its possible origin.⁷⁸ The only thing that could naturally find a place directly before עבִיר is a proper name. I venture to propose instead of יִשְׁכִּיל simply יִשְׂרָאֵל as the original reading of the text: "Behold, Israel my servant shall be exalted, shall rise aloft, and shall stand very high." Then the introduction corresponds to that in 42:1, and the order of words, יִשְׂרָאֵל עבִיר, to that in 44:1; and the placing over against each other of "the nation" and "the nations" at once becomes emphatic. I have not the slightest intention of using this textual emendation in support of the correct interpretation, or of basing anything upon it. But since the reference to the people of Israel has on all sides and in every passage proved to be the essential and only possible one, the probability in favor of this alteration certainly seems unusually strong; nor is it likely that anything simpler or more natural will suggest itself. Here, too, as elsewhere, especially in 53:8, the text has long had to suffer at the hands of those who adhere to a narrower interpretation, and who are willing to admit the possibility of such an exceedingly personal representation only in reference to an individual. This textual improvement, as we have seen, is not necessary to controvert the statement that the servant is nameless. But thereby it becomes probable that the name Israel was not lacking in the two songs in which the servant is introduced in the third person. In the two in which he appears in the first person the absence of the name is natural, and yet the author has in one of these (49:3) introduced the name, so that 50:4 ff. alone does not contain it.

In certain passages in which the servant of Yahweh is introduced in his own proper character, whether in the future, as in 42:1 ff., or in the present, as in 49:1 ff.; 50:4 ff., where he is himself the speaker, or in the past, his work already accomplished, as in 52:13—53:12, the prophet, who is one of the most versatile

⁷⁸ He merely establishes the fact that in the LXX the translation for יִרֹם is lacking, and considers it possible that originally יִשְׁכִּיל may have been lacking instead, and that only through corrections has ἰσχυρῶς come to take the place of the word for יִרֹם. It is altogether more probable that of these three entirely synonymous words one was from the beginning left untranslated.

and vivid of prophetic writers, employs a manner of representation of which he is particularly fond. In the very first chapter there are several examples of it side by side. In 40:3 the command is already given for the construction of the miraculous pathway through the desert; in vs. 9 Zion, the bearer of glad tidings, already sees the approach, under Yahweh's guidance, of the caravan which, according to 52:7 ff., still lies in the future. Again and again the prophet presents to the mind such vivid and strikingly realistic pictures of the salvation to come, only to turn again to the present, and by instruction, argument, and consolation to renew the tedious work of overcoming the opposition of the faint-hearted and to lift up the community with which he has to deal to the heights of knowledge and of faith which in those vivid pictures of the future he has presented as already attained. And in this way, as Wellhausen⁷⁹ correctly says, Deutero-Isaiah uses the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" as themes for his sermons. But to see anything exceptional in this circumstance, and on that account to attribute these themes to a different author, simply means that one of the fundamental laws of Deutero-Isaiah's rhetoric has been misunderstood. Not only are the sermons his own production, but often the themes also are his own.

An insight into this relation of the "songs" to the context, especially to the passages which follow them, disposes also of another supposed proof against their composition by Deutero-Isaiah—the proof based upon metrical considerations. In no case can any importance be attached to it. Sellin passes it by without further comment, because frequent changes of meter occur also in Deutero-Isaiah's other lyric passages.⁸⁰ Schian thinks that Duhm himself is not inclined to claim the change of meter as an argument for separating the first song from its context, particularly since he draws no conclusions from the same

⁷⁹ *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, erste Auflage, p. 117; cf. also CHEYNE, *Introduction*, p. 307.

⁸⁰ SELLIN, p. 97.

circumstance in 42:10 ff. and 44:23 ff.⁸¹ Nevertheless, Kittel⁸² mentions the rhythm as one of the grounds for assigning the songs to another author. This is without warrant, for, in the first place, the change from the lyrical form to the sermon, with its longer lines, is in Deutero-Isaiah almost invariably accompanied by a change of the rhythm. Duhm himself has proved this to be true for 40:1-11. Furthermore, the four "Ebed-Yahweh songs" are by no means all written in the same measure; on the contrary, the parallel lines of the trimeter movement, which are typical of the other three songs, are in 50:4 ff. replaced, according to Duhm's own evidence, by *Langverse*, or halting Kina-verses, of which Deutero-Isaiah is so fond. Finally, it may be mentioned that the meter of those other three songs is found a number of times in other parts also of Deutero-Isaiah. By way of illustration, 41:17-20, in close proximity to 42:1-4, will suffice. There Duhm himself acknowledges that the four-line stanza and the trimeter movement recur as regularly as in any one of the "songs."

Is it necessary still to discuss the linguistic characteristics of the songs? In this direction Schian has conducted a somewhat detailed investigation, which has been criticised and supplemented by Sellin.⁸³ The result in no wise favors the excision of the four songs and their assignment to a single author. For in regard to the first three Schian admits that the use of language is identical with that of Deutero-Isaiah,⁸⁴ while in the fourth, with H. Ewald, he believes that he has proved that there is an entirely different style. This, of course, leads him to assign 53:2 ff. to a third author, a view which, if correct, overthrows Duhm's entire theory. Sellin, on the contrary, correctly maintains that, in view of the great divergency of contents, the language of 52:13-53:12 also exhibits as close a correspondence with that of the rest of the book as could be expected. The reader who has once been convinced of the correct

⁸¹ Pp. 4 f.

⁸² *Commentar*, p. 379.

⁸³ Pp. 111 f.

⁸⁴ So also LAUE, p. 7.

interpretation of the servant will no longer be misled by the first somewhat strange impression made by the passage. It goes without saying that on the first and only occasion on which the author introduces the heathen and assigns a long speech to them, he should, to the utmost extent of his ability, give a special coloring to his forms of expression.

I think I have now adequately considered and controverted all, or nearly all, individual arguments in favor of the isolation of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," and against their interpretation in accordance with and as a part of the entire book, and in harmony with it. I do not flatter myself that I have thereby succeeded in convincing my opponents. When the mind has once become thoroughly permeated with the idea that a first impression is correct, the mental vision becomes so acute that it sees a thousand different arguments in support of that first impression. But, for the most part, these arguments are so imponderable that they cannot be submitted to the test of logical reasoning. This is true alike when the initial observation is unquestionably correct and when it is utterly false. Of all the prophetic books, Isa., chaps. 40-55, is probably the most unified, and the one which contains the best arrangement of subjects and climax of ideas. But under the influence of the preconceived opinion which I have been opposing, it has become customary to demand a consistency, a transparency and unity of ideas, which is nothing less than unreasonable to demand in a prophetic book. The writer, who is suffered to retain the name Deutero-Isaiah, is finally pinned down to a single thought in a single form of expression, which he must repeat everywhere, and beyond which he must nowhere venture. As a matter of fact, when along with the "songs" everything has been removed that has any connection with them, there remains scarcely a shadow of that former creation, sparkling and overflowing with vitality, which we have before us in Isa., chaps. 40-55; and when we take a second look at the fragments which have been cut out on the ground that they are patches, we find superb passages altogether in Deutero-Isaiah's characteristic style, beautiful in freshness and fluency. Is it not a marvelous thing that they should

have come forth in such perfection, at second and third hand, from so involved a process? I can only state my well-assured conviction to the contrary, namely, that though there are in Isa., chaps. 40-55, many textual errors, no doubt, and many short interpolations, yet no extended passages from the pen of another author; and, furthermore, that in point of time everything in this book seems to occur before the expected homecoming, or, if this never came to pass, as Kusters and his followers judge, then before the time at which the prophet expected the *joyeuse rentrée*. As respects chaps. 52 f. and chaps. 54 f., all the fulness of the expected glory, as well as all the depth of the final disappointment, still lies in the future.⁸⁵

But, on the other hand, it is only fair to show how little evidence has been demanded of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" that they had a separate existence before being received into our book. It is only a matter of four songs, of which none but the last reaches any considerable length. Now, it is certainly not incredible that a grateful nation or community might have sought to honor one of its heroes by dedicating to him a number of songs, but in that case we should expect this community to be in them all the speaker, and give direct expression to its feelings. Instead of that, however, when we consider their brevity, we find in the songs an astonishing variety. In the first God is the speaker, in the second and third it is the martyr himself, and only in the fourth does the community, which is supposed to be doing him honor throughout all the songs, take up the address. It surely cannot be the opinion of Duhm and his successors that the second and third songs were actually sung by the martyr himself. So that, by his introduction as the speaker, the scene of these two songs is manifestly laid antecedent to his death, while in the fourth he has already been raised from the dead. Now, in 50:4-9 the hero of the songs is already able to tell of grievous sufferings which he has had to endure in the performance of his mission. Nevertheless, he counts on Yahweh's assistance, and hopes to overcome all his

⁸⁵ This is directed especially against the first part of Kusters' treatise, and also against Cheyne's latest view.

enemies. In this hope he must have been disappointed, for, as we know from chap. 53, he afterward suffered martyrdom. His first period of suffering must have been followed by a second, which resulted in his death. Now, it is scarcely conceivable that just at this time, after his first and before his second experience of suffering, the grateful community should put the words of the song 50: 4 ff. into his mouth;⁸⁶ on the contrary, the only natural supposition, it seems to me, is that the whole cycle of songs was sung, if not after his resurrection, at least not until after his death. In that case we are dealing with entirely dramatic scenes, between which, however, important links are missing. The same applies to the second song, 49: 1 ff. Here we are looking back upon long periods of patient and impatient waiting, but as yet there is no mention of actual suffering. But now we come to the first song, 42: 1 ff., in which Yahweh himself becomes the speaker. This is not in itself unprecedented in a song, unless, however, it occurs, as here, without any introduction whatever. We have, therefore, to suppose that this introduction has disappeared, and with it no doubt the revelation of all the circumstances bearing on the case, which would also have given us definite information as to the identity of the martyr and the conditions of his times. Thus the four songs, when once they have been severed from their connection with the context and attributed to one source, permit of interpretation only as isolated fragments of a very elaborate and extensive composition, which must have been cast in a more or less dramatic form. Now, this situation presents not the slightest difficulty to the adherents of this theory, because the imaginative faculty has unbounded play, and is able immediately to satisfy all further requirements the moment they make their appearance. But at least this one fact should be recognized and borne in mind that, when the songs are thus severed from their connection, the problem has by no means been solved, but only propounded.

For this side of the question we have hitherto presupposed only the most uniform and undivided view, that is, the individualistic interpretation of all the four songs. How a still smaller

⁸⁶ And yet Sellin, p. 153, presupposes this as Duhm's self-evident view.

number — according to Schian, for example, three, or even, according to Laue, only two — should exhibit such marked differences is still more difficult to understand. Still less am I able to comprehend how Kusters and Bertholet can deny the fundamental feature of the entire theory, the individualistic interpretation of the servant, and yet accept all its remaining conclusions. Equally incomprehensible is the reverse method of procedure adopted by Sellin, who entirely sanctions the individualistic interpretation, and, in fact, considerably enlarges its scope, while he refuses to assent to any of the other conclusions, and not only attributes the songs to Deutero-Isaiah, but is also able to harmonize them with the passages in which the servant has an altogether different significance.

In whatever form or adaptation we may consider it, Duhm's theory has not tended to remove existing difficulties, but constantly to create new ones. When we have once arrived at a conviction, which is not only possible, but even imperative, that the individualistic interpretation is unfounded and impracticable, and that the explanation of the conception of the servant expressly furnished by the author himself holds good for all passages, we must at once cast aside all those confusing auxiliary hypotheses which have their origin and justification only in that false interpretation. We must rather learn to understand his figures from the author's originality. As respects the isolated difficulties which then remain, we must recollect that the conflict of interpretations is a very old one, so ancient, in fact, that false interpretation has here and there actually influenced the form of the text. Various opinions may exist as to how many places show such influence; but however this question may be decided, we have no right on the strength of a word like the עַבְדִּי in 53:8, or of what some may consider the only possible explanation of 49:5 f., to reject the interpretation of the servant of Yahweh which is fully confirmed by its relation to the whole context. Only by holding fast to this interpretation shall we be able to arrive again at a right appreciation of this "evangelist of the Old Covenant," who occupies an incomparably important position in preparing the way for the revelation of the New Covenant.